

of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but are not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of whether more than one genus is involved.

THE PRESIDENT next enquired whether the Section were of the opinion that a resolution in the foregoing terms adequately covered the field traversed in the preceding discussion. On the Section indicating their agreement on this point, the President suggested that some member of the Section should now formally bring forward a proposal that the Section adopt a resolution in this sense.

PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) then proposed, and Mr. C. F. DOS PASSOS (U.S.A.) seconded, a motion that the Section adopt a Resolution in the terms drafted by the President of the Section. After an opportunity had been given to any member of the Section, who might so desire, to move an amendment to the foregoing motion and no such amendment had been proposed, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in the "Règles"

6. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next item to be considered was the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" (binary nomenclature) as used in the *Règles*. The Section would recall that the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Lisbon in 1935 had charged the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to examine, and to submit to the present Congress a Report on, the meaning of the foregoing expression as used in the *Règles*. This action had been taken in the hope that an objective study of this subject, undertaken in consultation with leading specialists, would provide a means for bringing to an end the deplorable controversy which for so long had centred round this subject and which had come to a head in 1930 as the result of hasty and ill-considered action taken in the Section on Nomenclature at the Eleventh International Congress of Zoology. In the interval which had elapsed since the Lisbon Congress, this problem had been the subject of extensive discussions carried out on behalf of the Commission by their Secretary by correspondence with leading specialists in different parts of the world on the basis of a paper published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in which he had set out the issues involved and by extensive personal discussions at meetings held both in America and in Europe. It was extremely gratifying to find that, as the result of these discussions, the ground had

been cleared for a solution of this problem on terms which would be mutually acceptable to zoologists of all shades of opinion. A draft Report had been prepared for the consideration of the Commission on the basis of these discussions. Copies of this document had been distributed under cover of Commission Paper I.C.(48)5 and additional copies were available for any member of the Section who desired to have a copy for his or her personal use. The Commission had unanimously approved and adopted this Report and had authorised and requested the Secretary to sign it on their behalf and submit it to the President of the Section in discharge of the duty committed to the Commission by the Lisbon Congress.

The Commission pointed out in this Report that two distinct questions were involved: (1) What was the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as actually used in Articles 25 and 26 of the *Règles*? (2) Is that meaning the meaning which it is the general wish of zoologists should be conveyed by those Articles, and, if not, what change in the wording of those Articles is desirable? The examination carried out into the first of these questions had shown conclusively that, as used in the two Articles of the *Règles* concerned, the expression "nomenclature binaire" bore a meaning identical with that which would have been conveyed if, instead of that expression, the expression "nomenclature binominale" had been employed. As regards the second of the two questions involved, it was evident from the consultations which had been held that the foregoing meaning was also the meaning which the general body of zoologists desired should be conveyed by Articles 25 and 26, provided that suitable safeguards were introduced to protect certain generic names in common use which had been published subsequent to 1757 by authors who, while accepting the proposition that the name of a species should convey two concepts, that of the genus and that of the species, did not give effect to that proposition by using the Linnean system of binominal nomenclature. Accordingly, in the Report now submitted, the Commission recommended that both in Article 25 and in Article 26 the expression "nomenclature binominale" should be substituted for the expression "nomenclature binaire" and that the plenary powers should be used to protect the special class of generic names to which reference had just been made. It was further agreed that there should be attached to the *Règles* a schedule, to be known as the First Schedule (in contrast to the existing *Appendice*, which it was proposed should in future be known as the "Second Schedule"), in which should be inserted particulars of every decision taken by the Commission under their plenary powers. A record

would therefore be found in this Schedule of every decision taken by the Commission to validate generic names published by non-binominal authors or to validate books containing such names. Further, the Commission proposed that the Article which (earlier in the present meeting) the Section had agreed should be inserted in the *Règles* to incorporate the Plenary Powers Resolution of 1913, subject to certain amendments agreed upon by the Section, should contain a provision exempting applications for the validation of generic names or of books of the kind specified above from the regulations prescribing the giving of specified notice required in other cases involving the use by the Commission of their plenary powers. In one case of outstanding importance to ornithologists, namely, the generic names published by Brisson in 1760 in his "*Ornithologia*", the Commission had agreed to take action at once by placing that book in the proposed First Schedule to the *Règles*, thereby securing the immediate availability of the names in question. Consequential upon the foregoing conclusions, the Commission had agreed to cancel *Opinion* 20 (which contained an incorrect interpretation of the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire") and *Opinion* 37 (which stated—incorrectly—that under the existing *Règles* the generic names in Brisson's "*Ornithologia*" were nomenclatorially available) and to modify (in a manner which the President then explained) the wording of the "summary" of *Opinion* 24 and the title of *Opinion* 35.

In submitting the present Report to the Section and, through the Section, to the Congress, the Commission were happy to record that they had been able to achieve the unanimous settlement of a problem which had baffled every previous attempt to secure general agreement.

MR. N. D. RILEY (UNITED KINGDOM) said that the Commission was to be congratulated on the way in which they had discharged the duty imposed upon them by the Lisbon Congress. The task had been one of great difficulty, and the successful outcome of the labours of the Commission would, he felt sure, be warmly welcomed by the Section. He had pleasure in proposing the adoption of the Report of the Commission and its submission to the Congress.

PROFESSOR ENRIQUE BELTRÁN (MEXICO) said that he wished to associate himself with the tribute just paid to the work of the Commission in this matter. He seconded the motion proposed by Mr. Riley.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) then enquired whether any other member wished to comment on the Report and in particular whether any member

wished to move an amendment to the motion which had just been proposed. No such amendment was, however, proposed. THE PRESIDENT then put the motion to the Section, by whom it was unanimously adopted.

**Second Meeting
of the Section on
Nomenclature :
date and time
appointed**

7. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he did not propose to lay any further business before the Section at its present meeting. Good progress had been made by the Section in the important task before them, and there was every reason to hope that before the end of the Congress the Section would have completed the whole of their programme. The next meeting of the Section would be held at the same place on the morning of the following day, Saturday, 24th July, at 09.00 hours.

(The Section thereupon adjourned at 12.05 hours)